UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/635,669	08/07/2003	Lewis K. Cirne	P1954C-944	8894

21839   7590   07/27/2011
BUCHANAN, INGERSOLL & ROONEY PC
POST OFFICE BOX 1404
ALEXANDRIA, VA 22313-1404

EXAMINER
LIN, WEN TAI

ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
2454	

NOTIFICATION DATE	DELIVERY MODE
07/27/2011	ELECTRONIC

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

Notice of the Office communication was sent electronically on above-indicated "Notification Date" to the following e-mail address(es):

ADIPFDD@bipc.com
offserv@bipc.com

APPLICATION NO./ CONTROL NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR / PATENT IN REEXAMINATION	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.
10/635,669	07 August 2003	CIRNE ET AL.	P1954C-944

BUCHANAN, INGERSOLL & ROONEY PC
POST OFFICE BOX 1404
ALEXANDRIA, VA 22313-1404

EXAMINER
WEN-TAI LIN

ART UNIT	PAPER
2454	20110721

DATE MAILED:

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

Commissioner for Patents

The reply brief filed 5/23/2011 has been entered and considered. The application has been forwarded to the Board of Patent Appeals and Interferences for decision on the appeal.

In the reply brief the Appellant's arguments have been fully considered, but they are not deemed to be persuasive. However, rather than going over every details, the examiner would like to empahsize several key points as follows:

1. The notion of "an event specifying an assigned routing type" does not require that the event be added or modified to carry an extra information called "routing type" after the event has occurred and being sent on the way to the event handler. As noted in the Examiner's Answer, the Appellant's specification and drawings have not taught any routing type assignment. Hoa's method allows a user to pre-determine whether the forthcoming events would be shared or not. Together with the mouse clicking events and keyboard events, which inherently carries hardcoded "routing type", Hao's system is able to distinguish (and route to their respective target applications or human interfaces) sharable events (as shown in Fig. 3C) and another set of corresponding, unsharable events (not shown in the figures). As such, the aforementioned phrase is simply interpreted as "an event having associated information for dispatching the event to a target application."

2. The "routing mechanism" in the claims does not require finishing routing an event in one explicit step. For example, a shared mouse click event would first route the event to all the windows that share the event (via multicasting), followed by routing the event to a specific application locally as well as to their remote counterpart. Furthermore, the claim languages do not require that the routing types be mutually exclusive in terms of an event's final destination. For example, a shared mouse click event and a unshared mouse click event may be directed to the same local application, except that the shared mouse click event is also multicast to other remote destinations [see also Hao: col. 10 line 58 - col. 11 line 22; Fig. 9].

3. With respect to registering user's interest, the Appellant is directed to Hao: col. 7, lines 12-29, wherein inviting users to join a shared session comprises sending out invitation to selected users and relying to the invitation. Thus, when a shared group is formed, a shared event is sent to all the application instances, each running at a participating workstation. Thus, Hoa's event registration is performed at the creation stage of shared session.

/Wen-Tai Lin/
Primary Examiner, Art Unit 2454